

30 April 1959

TO: Chief, Administrative Staff, ORR
ATTENTION: [REDACTED] 25X1A9a
FROM: Chief, Industrial Division, ORR
SUBJECT: Comments on Proposed ORR Journal
REFERENCE: St/A's Memorandum, 1 April 1959

1. This office recognizes the value of an effective medium for transmitting timely and current information but doubts if a new publication similar to the sample, mock-up ORR journal which is described in the reference memo would achieve this end or would indeed be worth the time and effort that its preparation and maintenance would require. Furthermore, we find the existing mediums - ORR Daily Diary, area and division monthly reports, notices and regulations, etc. - adequate for transmitting pertinent ORR information.
2. Many charges are leveled at the ORR Daily Diary in its present form. This is not to say, however, that with the proper supervision and enforcement this Diary could not become the necessary effective medium that is desired. It has the advantages of being timely, current, succinct and informal. If analysts find its maintenance a burden, we predict a very short life for the elaborate ORR journal which is proposed.
3. Also, we view the proposed journal as one more piece of reading material to claim the analyst's time. Furthermore, if this journal is to contain all and sundry items including those of a substantive nature, its preparation would require considerable time on the part of analysts and division coordinators as well as the editorial staff. Additional administrative demands on analysts' time should be most carefully considered!
4. Finally, we question the suitability of many of the proposed types of material for inclusion in such a journal. Office notices and regulations, we feel, belong in their own series. Substantive articles do also. Personal tidbits of a purely "Aunt Minnie" nature take time to collect and in many cases have only very limited general appeal. We react quite strongly to the inclusion of promotion notices in any publication for general dissemination.
5. To re-iterate: We feel that the proposed journal would in many cases be duplicative and of little value. We suggest that time be spent on improving the ORR Daily Diary.

25X1A9a
[REDACTED]